



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

also that both were gafol-geldas, and that "by Alfred's time the chief practical division of classes had already resolved itself into that between the landed classes on one hand and their gafol-paying tenants on the other." The six-hynde class, the strangers in blood, Mr. Seebohm suggests, whose wergeld, like that of the Gallo-Roman, is fixed at half the freeman's, is "a rung in the ladder" by which the dependent classes once climbed into the possession of land and kindred, a rung which later dropped out.

Back of Alfred, Mr. Seebohm finds that the division into twelve-hynde and twy-hynde men practically disappears and a new division into gesithcund and ceorlisc men becomes prominent. These earlier and later divisions, however, he believes come to mean practically the same thing. From the value of the gesithcundman's oath, from King Ine's law regarding the 10 hides "to foster," and from the relation of the gesithcundman to the king, the interesting conclusion is drawn, but not proved, that the gesithcundman may have been given a ten-hide unit of land from which he was to pay the king's gafol, that is, the *firma unius noctis*, making for this purpose a part of his land gesetland held by gafol-payers in much the same position towards him that he is in towards the king. This dependence of one class upon another is not the result of degradation, but may be explained by the conditions of the original conquest. Thus proceeding along tribal lines alone, Mr. Seebohm would find early in English history something very like Professor Maitland's technical definition of a manor. The "free lordless villages" of Professor Maitland, which are, of course, a stumbling-block in the way of such early and wholesale manorialization, are ascribed to Danish influences.

However far one can go with Mr. Seebohm in some of these conclusions, — and he himself admits that approaching "a subject which has many sides from one side only necessarily results in the restatement rather than the solution of some problems" — it must be agreed that he has succeeded in elucidating some of the dark passages in Anglo-Saxon law, in giving new and very interesting meaning to many terms in that law, and in establishing his point that tribal custom must not be disregarded as one factor in Anglo-Saxon economic development.

N. NEILSON.

*L'Empire Carolingien: ses Origines et ses Transformations.* Par ARTHUR KLEINCLAUSZ. (Paris: Hachette. 1902. Pp. xvi, 611.)

*Quomodo Primi Duces Capetianæ Stirpis Burgundiæ Res gesserint, 1032-1162.* Thesim Facultati Litterarum Parisiensi proponebat A. KLEINCLAUSZ. (Dijon: Barbier-Marillier. 1902. Pp. viii, 116.)

It is doubtless to the French custom of requiring for the doctorate two theses, one in Latin and one in the vernacular, that we owe the simultaneous appearance of these two works. That this does not argue the youth of their author need not be pointed out to any who know what

goes to the making of a French thesis and how many of the maturest products of French scholarship have thus seen the light. Dr. Kleinclausz, for some years a *Chargé de Cours* at the University of Dijon, is even on this side of the Atlantic already known by name as the scholar to whom, with Professor Bayet, has been assigned the Meroving-Caroling portion of the magistral co-operative history of France now appearing under the editorship of Lavissee.

That even a French *doctorandus*, however, should in this day of specialization attack such a theme as the Carolingian Empire is a notable thing. True, Mr. Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire* was originally but an Oxford prize essay; but there have not been wanting those who have cited precisely this classic of Mr. Bryce as the sort of thing we might never hope for again from the universities. M. Kleinclausz has undertaken — he has even borrowed Mr. Bryce's words to state his purpose — to do for the Carolingian Empire what Mr. Bryce has done for the Empire as a whole. If his task is narrower, it is yet vast; and to a much larger degree it rests on first-hand research; for the Carolingian Empire, as such, has thus far lacked a monograph. Even the noble study of Döllinger, to which all later scholars (and not least M. Kleinclausz) owe so much, breaks off its narrative with the crowning of Charles the Great; what further interests it is only the survival of that event in the tradition of the Germanic Empire.

To the origins of the medieval Empire, from the fall of Rome to the coronation of Charles, M. Kleinclausz, too, gives much space — a third of his book; and if in this much-worked field he has given us nothing new, he has shown everywhere a sane and independent judgment. Even those of us who are still fain, with Döllinger, to attribute the Donation of Constantine to an earlier day than Pope Hadrian's, or who are ready, with Einhard and with Hauck, to believe the great Frank an unwilling emperor, must admit the fairness with which his lucid narrative, while accepting views now more current, leaves room for free interpretation. He maintains, indeed, that the Carolingian Empire was the creation less of men than of circumstances; and not Hauck himself has so clearly shown how slow was Charles to take up the new function, or how essentially ecclesiastical he counted it.

But to M. Kleinclausz all this is introduction. The heart of his book is the story of that neglected century following the death of Charles, to which Mr. Bryce, even in his latest edition, gives less than three pages. To show that throughout this period the idea of the empire remained potent, — that the struggle of great statesmen to realize and maintain it explains the tangled politics of the reign of Louis the Pious, — that even after the partition of Verdun had dealt it a death-blow the "*régime de la concorde*" inherited the moral ideals of the older "*système de l'unité*," — that the princes who still grasped at the imperial title — a Louis II., a Charles the Bald, a Charles the Fat — were men of sounder abilities and loftier aims than is commonly supposed, — that even when its effective territory had shrunk to the mere realm of Italy and less the

Empire still lived its larger life in European thought, and had not faded from the dreams of men before the Ottos gave it new reality: this is his central theme. Suggestion he owes to Himly and to Lapôte, and much of pioneer work to those German scholars whose views it gives him so keen a satisfaction to oppose; but the results of his own research are large and fresh and important. One important document accepted by earlier scholars — the letter of Louis II. to the Greek Emperor Basil — he rejects as a forgery; and a chapter is devoted to proving it so. Its inspirer, thinks M. Kleinclausz, was Pope John VIII. himself, its probable author the librarian Anastasius, its true date the year 879.

The Latin thesis of Dr. Kleinclausz is a less ambitious essay. The first five Capetian Dukes of Burgundy have been sadly eclipsed by their more self-willed and aggressive successors; but from the scanty records left us M. Kleinclausz is able to show how it was their tact, their loyalty, their piety, their patience under royal assumption and feudal turbulence, that made possible under changed conditions the duchy's later prominence. These showings in no wise contravene, but happily supplement the results of such other modern workers in Burgundian history as Petit and Seignobos.

GEORGE L. BURR.

*The Growth and Decline of the French Monarchy.* By JAMES MACKINNON, Ph.D. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1902. xx, 840.)

DR. MACKINNON tells us that his book "has grown out of a desire to investigate the origins of the French Revolution." Since these "causes were indirect as well as direct, remote as well as immediate," he found it necessary to review "the history of monarchic France from the Middle Ages onward." But becoming "engrossed" in his subject he studied it "apart from its direct bearing on the Revolution." Looking "at each successive reign from the standpoint of its effects on its period rather than on the future" and regarding the growth of the monarchy as "a process of evolution," he has written "as much a succinct history of the French people as of the French kings." Unfortunately, however, in working out this rather ambitious and inclusive plan he has fallen into several grievous errors.

In his desire to wear a new path through an old field he has been too negligent of critical monographic writing. He has therefore, in view of the pretentious character of his work, incorporated into the details of his narrative an inexcusably large number of mistakes: *e. g.*, the unqualified statement (p. 23) that Colonna subjected Boniface to personal violence; (p. 25 ff.) the prominence given to the Salic law in determining the succession from Philip V. to Philip VI.; (p. 31) Charles of Evreux could have no "prior claim" over Edward as the nearest male descendant of Philip IV., — Charles, by the way, was not born till 1332; (p. 38) the Hundred Years' War was much more than "a mere genealogical contention," and at least part of the blame for it (p. 85) must